

REMARKS

In the May 14, 2004 Office Action, the drawings and specification (i.e. the disclosure) were objected to, and claims 11-20 stand rejected for being indefinite and under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the May 14, 2004 Office Action, Applicant has amended the specification, claims 11 and 15, and the drawings, as indicated above. Thus, claims 11-20 are pending, with claim 11 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Entry of September 29, 2003 Preliminary Amendment

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Office Action indicates that Applicant's September 29, 2003 Preliminary Amendment has been entered.

Drawings

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Office Action indicates that the formal drawings were received on October 14, 2003 and are accepted.

In paragraph 3-4 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because Fig. 5 should have the referential numeral "162" to indicate the operating member. In response, Applicant has filed herewith a replacement drawing sheet amending Fig. 5 to include the referential numeral "162". Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Specification

In paragraphs 6-7 of the Office Action, the specification was objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.75(d)(1) and MPEP §608.01(o), i.e. for not providing proper antecedent basis for the "first and second ends" of the operating link and because the continuity data should be updated. In response, Applicant has amended the specification to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitations of claim 11, and to reflect updated continuity data for this application. Also claim 11 has been amended to conform to the amended specification. Finally, the specification and claims have been amended for consistency, and to correct a minor error. These amendments are explained below.

Specifically, the specification now correctly reflects that this application is a divisional application of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/041,557 filed on January 10, 2002, now U.S. Patent No. 6,694,840. Also, the specification now basically recites that the operating link 164 includes an operating portion 164a that can be considered a second portion of the operating link 164 and a coupling portion 164b that can be considered a first portion of the operating link 164. Similarly, independent claim 11 now calls for an operating link having a first portion movably coupled to the first operating member and a second portion mounted on a second pivot axle. Applicant has also amended the specification and claims 1 and 15, as needed, to clarify that the members 140, 142 and 148 are first, second and auxiliary pivot axles, respectively. Applicant believes that the specification is now more consistent with respect to both embodiments, and that the claim terminology is now more clearly consistent with the terminology of the specification.

Applicant believes that the specification now fully complies with 37 CFR §1.75(d)(1) and MPEP §608.01(o). Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In paragraphs 7-8 of the Office Action, claims 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicant has amended claim 11.

Specifically, claim 11 now requires an operating link having a first portion movably coupled to the first operating member and a second portion mounted on an auxiliary pivot axle, the auxiliary pivot axle being spaced from the first pivot axle and arranged to be parallel to the first pivot axle. As mentioned above, Applicant has also amended the specification and claims 1 and 15, to clarify that the members 140, 142 and 148 are first, second and auxiliary pivot axles, respectively. Applicant believes that the specification is now more consistent with respect to both embodiments, and that the claim terminology is now more clearly consistent with the terminology of the specification.

In any case, Applicant believes that the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

In paragraph 9-10 of the Office Action, claims 11-20 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-14 and 16-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,840. In response, Applicant has filed

herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to clarify the record with respect to the claim terminology of the instant application and U.S. Patent No. 6,694,840. The terms "axle" and "path" used in the claims of the instant application and U.S. Patent No. 6,694,840 are not being used interchangeably. Rather, the "paths" of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,840 refer to the moving directions of the operating members, while the "axles" refer to elements, which control movement of various members.

Prior Art Citation

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record as being considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11-20 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick A. Hilsmier
Reg. No. 46,034

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: June 30, 2004

G:\06-JUN04-SMM\SN-US015180A Amendment.doc